

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending. By this response, claims 1 and 4 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following comments are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Zhang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,136,541) and alternatively under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) in view of Zhang et al. (U.S. 2004/0076343) and claims 2, 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Zhang and Utagawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,563,538). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a plurality of interpolation circuits, each interpolation circuit independently calculating interpolation candidate data of the same interpolation pixel based on calculations performed on test interpolation data of a plurality of normal pixels neighboring the interpolation pixel, where each interpolation circuit uses a different interpolation method... selecting one of the interpolation methods based on a difference between the test interpolation data and actual pixel data of said plurality of normal pixels.

Claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, calculating using a plurality of interpolation circuits, interpolation candidate data of a interpolation pixel independently by each of said plurality of interpolation circuits based on test interpolation data of a plurality of normal pixels neighboring the interpolation pixel, where each of said plurality of interpolation circuits use a different interpolation method... selecting one of the interpolation methods based on a difference between the test interpolation data and actual pixel data of said plurality of normal pixels.

Applicants respectfully submits that Zhang fails to teach the above features.

Zhang et al. teaches obtaining different absolute pixels values for different pixels located in different edge directions. Zhang teaches that this method is “preferably executed as software executing on an image processing device, although it may be implemented with hardware or combinations thereof.” *See column 7, lines 4-7.*

This teaching details how a single method may be implemented using one or more means. It does not teach using a “different interpolation method” as alleged by the Examiner. The same method is used only implemented in one or more ways by software, hardware or a combination thereof. Thus, Zhang does not teach using different interpolation methods and selection thereof as claimed by applicants.

Further, Zhang et al. does not teach or suggest calculating interpolation candidate data by obtaining test interpolation data from repeating an analysis of the same pixels under different interpolation methods and then comparing the results of a test interpolation data from amongst those obtained. In contrast, Zhang et al. teaches a single method in which multiple edge directions are used in obtaining interpolated pixel values for comparison proposes.

Thus, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Zhang et al. does not teach each and every feature of Applicant’s independent claims as required. Further, Utagawa does not remedy the deficiency of Zhang as Utagawa is provided to teach based on the dependent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7 are distinguished from the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings, Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No.: 10/541,611
Amendment dated May 4, 2009
Reply to Office Action dated February 4, 2009

Docket No.: 0925-0220PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 4, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Chad J. Billings
Registration No.: 48,917
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicants